

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 9, 2004, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 7-118 are cancelled and claims 119-125 are added; as a result, claims 1-6 and 119-125 are now pending in this application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik (4,499,385).

Applicant traverses the rejection since the cited reference does not include each limitation recited in the claim and there is no suggestion in the art to make the alleged modification. As admitted by the Office Action, Slavik does not disclose “a sensor for automatically determining the amp service level of the shore power,” as recited in claim 1. However, the Office Action asserts that “it is obvious that the load current sensor (58) capable of determining the amp service level of the shore power input to the recreation vehicle,” and “[i]t would have been obvious ... to implement the sensor disclose by Slavik for automatically determining the amp service level of the shore power.”

Applicant traverses. Slavik specifically states that “[i]f the user desires to alter the current threshold ... he merely activates the switch 86.” (Col. 6, lines 4-9). The load current sensor 58 determines the load of the Slavik system. This can range from 0 to 6 to 16 amps, as stated in Table 2 in column 4 of Slavik. This sensor determines the load, it does not automatically determine the amp service level of the source power. In Slavik, the amp service level is manually set by the user. Typical amp service levels are 20, 30, or 50 amps. The amp service level has nothing to do with the sensor 58 used to determine the load. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik in view of Pressman et al. (5,555,483).

Claim 2 includes each limitation of its parent claim and is not obvious in view of the cited references since the secondary reference does not overcome the deficiencies of the primary reference discussed above. For instance, even if combined, the combination does not include “a sensor for automatically determining the amp service level of the shore power,” as recited in claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slavik, Pressman et al, and further in view of Proctor et al. (5,583,413).

Claims 3-6 include each limitation of their parent claim and are not obvious in view of the cited references since the secondary reference does not overcome the deficiencies of the primary reference discussed above.

Moreover, Slavik provides no suggestion or motivation for including a rechargeable power source. The Slavik patent deals with controlling the load in view of the available shore power and does not discuss rechargeable power sources to supplement the shore power. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 359-3267 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.


Respectfully submitted,

DAVID J. KOENIG ET AL.

By their Representatives,


SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 359-3267

Date 3/9/05

By 
Peter C. Maki
Reg. No. 42,832

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 9 day of March, 2005.

CANDIS BUENDING
Name


Signature